

PATENT

Serial No. 09/623,141

Amendment in Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2005

IN THE DRAWING

Please replace FIGS 1-2 with the enclosed replacement

FIGS 1-2.

PATENT
Serial No. 09/823,141
Amendment in Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2003

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present Application and entry of the present Amendment are respectfully requested.

By means of the present Amendment, the Specification has been amended to correct certain informalities.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for being illegible. In response, Replacement sheets including FIGs 1-2 are enclosed. Further, an annotated drawing sheet with marked-ups in bold of the sheet showing changes to FIG 2 is enclosed for convenience where a box designated as SW 119 has been added for conformance with the Specification, such as on page 6, next to last line; page 8, paragraph [0023], lines 3 and 8; paragraph [0024], line 7; and paragraph [0025], line 2. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the drawings objection and approval of the enclosed proposed drawing changes.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 7 and 12 are substantially duplicative. In response, claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice, and claim 10 has been amended to change dependence thereof from canceled claim 7 to claim 11.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 3-7 and 10-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,697,103 (Fernandez). In response, the following

PATENT
Serial No. 09/823,141
Amendment in Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2005

remarks are presented.. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-7 and 10-18 are patentable over Fernandez for at least the following reasons.

Fernandez discloses an integrated network for monitoring remote objects, where cameras detect objects and generate image signals, as recited in the Abstract. Other monitoring devices may also be used as recited on column 6, lines 16-20. Column 4, lines 17-22 and column 9, line 26 to column 10 line 4 are cited on pages 4-6 of the Final Office Action to show "scheduling means configured for scheduling said task," and to show:

- (d) monitoring means for
 - (i) receiving and processing said first and second signals transmitted from said first sensor;
 - (ii) generating a reminder message for display to said user to perform said scheduled task;
 - (iii) automatically removing said reminder message upon receiving said second signal from said first sensor indicating completion of said scheduled task (emphasis added)

as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 11.

It is respectfully submitted that Fernandez does not disclose or suggest the particular scheduler recited in independent claims 1 and 11 that generate and removes reminders. Rather, Fernandez

PATENT
Serial No. 09/823,141
Amendment in Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2005

merely teaches a database that is updated with location of sensors, as a function of time or schedule, as recited on column 4, lines 17-20. The database may include a schedule associated with movement in monitored locations, where object presence is determined and appropriate alerts are provided such as "when object delivery is late, early on schedule, unscheduled, or absents." (See column 9, lines 33-35) The Fernandez system can also schedule monitoring or coordinate timely delivery of products or services, as recited on column 9, lines 51-54.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Fernandez of "generating a reminder message for display to said user to perform said scheduled task; [and] automatically removing said reminder message upon receiving said second signal from said first sensor indicating completion of said scheduled task" as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 11.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 11 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-6, 10 and 12-18 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 11, as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the dependent claims.

PATENT
Serial No. 09/823,141
Amendment in Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2005

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position as well as the right to introduce relevant secondary considerations including long-felt but unresolved needs in the industry, failed attempts by others to invent the invention, and the like, should that become necessary.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
September 15, 2005


Enclosure: Replacement drawing sheets (2 sheets with FIGs 1-2)
Annotated sheet (1 sheet showing changes to FIG 2)
Petition for one month extension of time
Authorization to charge credit card \$110 for one month extension

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101

Annotated Sheet

Reply to Final Office Action of 5/17/05

S/N 09/823,141



100

FIG 2

Drawn to scale
as shown